DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 999 PS 014 031

AUTHOR Burns, Robin
TITLE Development Education and Peace Education: From Conflict to Co-Operation. UNICEF Development Education Paper No. 22.
INSTITUTION United Nations Children's Fund, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Higher Education; History; Innovation; *Organizations (Groups); *Professional Associations; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Development Education; *Peace Education; United Nations

ABSTRACT

Parallels between three main approaches to development education and peace education are pointed out in this discussion. Specifically examined are informational, community action, and "qualitative" approaches to development education and correspondences in the growth of peace education. The document also describes organizational forms of development education and peace education as well as activities undertaken within institutions of formal education at primary, secondary, and higher education levels. Topics discussed include the role of professional associations, both national and international, and the separation of issues in the United Nations system. It is concluded that, whereas both educational concerns have common goals, hopes, and methods, development and peace education are separate activities competing for time, attention, and resources. Their integration is viewed as desirable and possible. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

PS 014051 ED247999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

United Nations Children's Fund

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Information
Division
UNICEF
United Nations
New York

Tel: 754-1234

Cables:
UNICEF-New York

Telex: 127895

Service de
l'Information
UNICEF
Palais des Nations
1211 Genève

Tél: (022) 34 60 11

Télégrammes:
UNICEF-Genève

Télex: 27 908

UNICEF

Development Education
Paper No. 22

DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND PEACE EDUCATION:

FROM CONFLICT TO CO-OPERATION

by Robin Burns

There are many different ways in which people around the world name and describe the central problems of our times. Two central concerns, however, revolve around the issue of development - both the misery which lack of material development entails and the problems which overdevelopment brings in its wake - and of violence, conflict and war. There are common elements in both, based on the distribution of power and resources which give rise to structures for the maintenance of power through the use of physical force or, more commonly, inequalities which have been called "structural violence" since they prevent people from changing their situation and realising their hopes and potentials.

While outright war is an ever-present threat to prevent change or to impose it on the balance of power, there are other means in what has been called a "spiral of violence" which starts in the oppression of one person or group by another. If peace and development are deep human desires which are frustrated by the present distribution of power, it is important to understand some of the mechanisms used to maintain this situation. Perhaps the most widespread means is the process of socialisation, the way in which not only the detailed knowledge, skills, values and so on are transmitted from one generation to the next, but also the frameworks for acting in and reflecting on the world.

Dr. Robin Burns is Lecturer in Comparative Education at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

The ways in which we learn about the world have important implications for the images on which we act and think about ourselves and our relationships with others, our sense of our own worth and that of others, and how we act - or feel unable to act - in the world. Seeing that many agencies for socialisation such as schools seem dedicated to maintaining the status quo, there has not only been a growing criticism of this but also a range of attempts to ensure that important human problems and ways of thinking and acting in relationship to them become a part of the formal socialisation process. In this discussion I am concerned with two such attempts, development education and peace education, each of which has developed in response to criticisms of the ways in which these issues are taught - or ignored - in education.

Development Education and Peace Education - the Background

Development education began in the late 1960s. It was a response to the call at the end of the first United Nations Development Decade for much greater effort to be put into "mobilising public opinion" to increase aid giving by rich nations. More information would lead to more action, it was hoped. Some people also realised that a different kind of information was needed, which would in particular focus on the historical and present relationships between rich and poor countries, especially the political, economic and military ties which have tended to maintain some countries in a dependent and underdeveloped condition. Such an analysis leads to educational programmes which aim to mobilise people not just to demand more aid, but to reexamine and change policies in fields like trade. Further, the whole concept of development can be questioned, both as a single process which some must struggle to achieve, and as a problem mainly for the poor countries, since an examination of hindrances to the development of some inevitably lead to thinking about development as a process in all societies and which increasingly points to the interdependence between societies.

As thinking about development and about education for development has grown and diversified, three main approaches can be seen to co-exist:

1. The informational, which I shall call "quantitative", where an increase in the amount of information about developing countries and issues is the main goal. The proponents of this approach have been most successful in gaining acceptance in formal education. It doesn't rock the boat too much, and although there is increasing pressure on schools to include more and more areas of knowledge within the curriculum, information can be attractively packaged and handed to teachers who can be persuaded to use it. How it is used is not always according to the intentions of those who provide the information. I am reminded of the case of a primary teacher who rang the Freedom from Hunger teachers' centre in Australia with the request, "I'd like something about hunger. But nothing too heavy, something light and amusing would be ideal." Clearly, just increasing the amount of information can only go so far if teachers have no framework for thinking about the issues and relating them to other school activities.

2. Partly as a reaction to some techniques used in the informational approach, and to the realization that information alone does not bring about action or change in the attitudes which lead to sustained action rather than a short-term, often emotional response (the so-called "starving child appeal"), community action has come to play a role in development education. It is

based on the idea of learning by doing and has the added appeal that it is equally applicable in developed and developing countries whereas other approaches tend to be limited to informing people in developed countries about problems in developing ones. Community action is based on involvement in a concrete situation, in which the participants come to change their situation through working together on a common project, and it is hoped that this will lead to a change in their knowledge about social processes.

There are two major criticisms of this approach. Firstly, there is a danger that the participants will become too immersed in local issues. These are important, for example, working with single mothers or immigrant or ethnic minority groups, and development issues are involved. But sight is often lost of the complexity and inter-relatedness of development, so that the action becomes an end in itself with few connections with broader considerations. Secondly, in developing countries community development can be seen as the way to improve the circumstances of selected groups - again, an important humane outcome - but fails to relate underdevelopment in one place with the situation in similar communities in and between nations. To improve the situation of one group may simply take pressure off a government to change the policies which continue to maintain large numbers of people in a state of underdevelopment.

3. The "qualitative" development educators have taken a different course. They are not just limited to trying to increase the knowledge about development issues through information or action alone, but to use a method of working which starts with the immediate reality of the participants in the educational programme but through a process of questioning, action and reflection on that action seeks to place the local situation in a broader context. Some examples of starting places include action in solidarity with migrant or minority groups, questioning candidates about their attitudes to development assistance during an election campaign, mobilising peasants through literacy programmes, union action in a developed country to press for better conditions for workers in the same company in a developing country, and joint action by conservationists and peace activists in a local community where a nuclear energy plant is planned. The aim is to start with a situation, including concrete action in it, to see that situation in the light of its connections with other situations, issues and processes. Such approaches have more commonly taken place outside formal schooling since a critique of present practice is implied in the learning process. Some would go so far as to say that the very nature of schools, with their hierarchies and power over people's later life chances, prevent the possibility of real development education taking place within them.

Parallels are found within the growth of <u>peace education</u>:

1. At first peace education was largely associated with the concept of "negative peace" or the absence of war. This led to teaching about the bad aspects of war, often through the handing down of the results of studies on the causes of war done by expert peace researchers, or even just playing on people's emotions so that they would fear and hate war. This strand continues, in particular in those approaches to disarmament education where the main message is to convince people to use every means to stop the arms race, even where this means pushing for unilateral disarmament. War is seen as the greatest threat and insult to humanity, and issues such as development are

considered unimportant at least until the absence of war has been achieved.

2. Growing out of this is a concern to develop attitudes and skills which will decrease support for war, through constructive conflict resolution. It is, like community development work, starting a process at the local level. The non-violent methods of Mahatma Gandhi form the central model for this approach, although the methods themselves rather than their application to public protest is most usually emphasised. Some critics maintain that this merely pacifies people so that they do not perceive and act against the continued militarism of the super-powers or even their own nations. Like community development approaches to development education, or an interpersonal communication skills emphasis in multicultural education, the teaching of conflict resolution skills is seen to oversimplify the root causes of war/the arms race (or underdevelopment or poor inter-ethnic or racial relations).

3. There are three main elements in the third approach to peace education:

- a concern to maintain the inter-relationships between peace research, peace education and peace action, which are different but vital aspects of the search for peace and which should therefore be combined in any programme bearing the name "peace education";

- an acceptance of social justice as a basic concept in the search for peace, leading to the promotion of a notion of positive peace as the absence of structural violence;

- the development of new forms of practice based on action and reflection, which include the use of findings about attitudes and values, especially militarism and sexism which are underlying ways in which support for violent conflict resolution or suppression of opposition is continued. This leads to educational programmes in which the process and the contents matter. Learning to analyse situations, and to act in the light of this, reflecting on the results as the basis for the next step, is thus central. The elimination of both direct and structural violence is necessary for the promotion of a more just world.

Relationships between Development Education and Peace Education

One example of the perceived relationships between development and peace is found in the Swedish Alternative Nobel Peace Prize, awarded by the Right Livelihood Foundation for those working on "real problems in the world". This prize was shared in 1981 by three people: Mike Cooley, chairman of the group for alternative technological development amongst the workers at the British Lucas Aerospace Corporation, Patrick van Rensburg, who for twenty years has been working with youth to develop an educational process based on productive work in Botswana and has now set up a Foundation for Education with Production in Zimbabwe, and Australian Bill Mollison who has developed a new, ecologically sound system for farming known as permaculture.

This is not an isolated example of the common threads. Although the main concerns have differed initially, both have had a similar development and diversification from an exclusive concern with development and peace respectively, towards an understanding of human potential, society and change which share basic features. These features include an analysis of the operation of power in and between societies, of the ways in which overt and structural violence are used to maintain the power of some, and a commitment

to educational processes which aim to increase the awareness of people of their powerlessness and their participation in action to try to change that. There is a basic concept of the human being as one who has potentials which should be allowed to develop as much as possible free from restrictions owing to sex, race, religion, wealth or political beliefs; of society as a developing means for the realization of human potential through participation in public processes; and of change as necessary in order to bring about a more just order within and between nations, communities and other groups.

The parallels especially between type one educational activities (the information) have been seen to keep development and peace education apart when the focus is on the content and specific goals. In order to see the similarities and differences in more detail, and the bases for increased co-operation, it is necessary to look at the organizational development and activities of both, which show the unfolding of ideas and of separate ways in which these have been implemented.

1. Organizational Forms. Development education has emerged from the informational work of development assistance agencies. A better understanding of development was considered necessary to increase fund giving, and this included political action to change the aid and related policies of governments in developed countries. Development education was thus associated largely with the developed countries, education for development being a term used for the process of trying to involve people in developing countries in their nation's development efforts. Jørgen Lissner has distinguished three approaches to development education within agencies - the fund-raisers, the middle-of-the-roaders (who may fund separate educational groups to avoid problems within their agency when the tenor of education becomes too political or critical of aid itself, often leading to uneven education which depends on the way it is viewed by the executives of the agency), and the educators who see it as a valuable activity in itself. These approaches have been generalized to development education outside agencies, as shown earlier in the outline of the major concepts of development education. It has only been with the growth of solidarity groups and those critical of the whole western approach to development that the development education work of agencies has become distinct from development assistance.

Peace education has emerged both from peace action and peace research. In some cases it is still seen to be synonomous with either - activities to promote peace at both the political and mass movement levels, to inform people of issues involved, and the study of conflict or the communication of the results of peace and conflict research by specialists. To a greater extent than in development assistance agencies, peace activists and peace researchers have overlapped so that research has played a larger role here than it has in development work by agencies. Now the content of peace education is sometimes a local concern, such as lobbying against a national defence policy or promoting action for justice within a community, but many consider that it must maintain a global orientation. Peace education has been free from the pressure to raise money for "peace projects" but has relied more than development education on expert advice rather than local initiative for the information to be conveyed.

The tying of each type of education to specific goals, third world development, and peaceful conflict resolution and abolition of war, and the growth of specific organizations to promote these, has simply led to a failure to perceive common cause at any level. It has only been the broadening of the

concepts of development and peace that has enabled joint goals, processes and activities to be conceived.

2. Activities at the Level of Formal Education:

A. Primary and Secondary Schools. Arising out of the separate definition of goals, there have been different approaches to, and relationships with, formal education. At the level of primary and secondary education, development educators in agencies have had more "success" than peace educators in placing their material, holding workshops for teachers, and generally increasing the use of developing countries as examples and of development issues such as basic human needs. The reason for this is partly because there is a place in various traditional subjects for the study of foreign countries and cultures, and partly because there is increasing use by schools of theme-oriented, even inter-disciplinary approaches. At least those teachers who are interested can teach about developing countries so long as they have material and can make space in the curriculum.

Much of such teaching is quantitative - adding extra examples - and concerned with development only in the developing countries. The way in which subjects are arranged and knowledge is divided up between them tends to maintain the separation of issues. For example, Asian Studies enjoyed some support and growth in Australian schools, stimulated by special government grants. Then issues of the multicultural nature of Australian society seemed more pressing, and both the loss of the Asian Studies grants and the perceptions of teachers that the migrant children in their classroom were more relevant, has led to a struggle to maintain Asian Studies and a failure to see that the central issues in Asia and multicultural Australia involve similar structures and processes, so that either example could be used to teach about the situation and lead on to other examples.

Peace education is also adopted most often by teachers who are prepared for mainly personal reasons to try to add another topic to their programmes. It gains less ready acceptance by educational authorities, since it is seen to be more "value laden" as a concept than development, and more easily antagonistic to national policies. It is also easier to teach the evils of past wars than to examine the unpeacefulness of the present world, and history is most often seen as the place where the topic could be raised. As one teacher complained to me, war is more dramatic than peace and therefore easier and more attractive to teach. Conflict, on the other hand, can also be isolated, like developing countries, and studied in the context of race relations, community relations or even inter-personal relations with no reference to international conflict.

If, as suggested here, it is easier to include the study of developing countries than of international development, interdependence and local development in a global context, or to include the study of peace, then there is some room for tension between the advocates of the two as distinctive approaches. Is this only a problem in developed, capitalist countries? People in developed western nations probably all think they know what is taught about the war-like West in Eastern bloc schools, and the association of peace-loving with communism is not the smallest reason why it is difficult to promote peace and internationalist ideas in the schools of their countries. They know less about the situation in developing countries, but could guess at least that national development forms an increasing content in formal education and that wars of independence in particular would also have a ready place in education there. It is therefore not just between topics and

subjects, but types of countries that peace and development education are kept separate and in potential conflict for time, resources and attention in formal schools.

B. Higher (Tertiary) Education. A different situation exists at this level, not least because the term "studies" rather than education is most often used. Development studies are included in three main ways - in those disciplines where development is a valid topic (e.g. economics), in area studies of geographical regions, and as options in those subjects where developing countries can be used as examples (such as non-western literature or sociology).

Peace studies are most often possible within international relations, politics or law, where the study is limited to the trans-national level, or the study of conflict within a nation in, for example, sociology.

New possibilities for both are presented in the recent growth of specialist research and post-graduate institutes. Economics tends to dominate Development Studies institutes, and politics the Peace and Conflict Studies ones, though both are usually nominally inter-disciplinary. There are two main ways in which these institutes have come into being - through the need of governments for research and policy advice, and through successful lobbying of government or other funding institution or foundation. Both give rise to basic weaknesses and to competition since there is a tendency to frame the research in ways acceptable to the funders, funding may be uncertain over time, and both these give rise to some diminishing of the critical ability of the researchers. As at the school level, development studies have been more successful than peace studies since they are more justifiable in terms of government interests. The related problems have not, however, given rise to co-operation, and the development of separate institutes rather tends to isolate the common ideas and contacts between researchers, and the funding sources. Another factor limiting the study of both development and peace at the tertiary level is the nature of academic study itself. The western model of "scientific study" emphasises objectivity and an approach to research in which values (and attitudes, actions and feelings) may be the object of research but have no role in the research process. There are exceptions, such as the practical work undertaken in the undergraduate programmes of the Third World Centre at the University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands and the School of Peace Studies at Bradford University in England. However, in general this is not so, and the rigid discipline-based structure of most tertiary institutions further isolates the forms and content of the respective studies.

3. The Role of Professional Associations. The isolation is also reflected within national and international professional groups. There are no groups with the combined title "Development and Peace Studies". The Society for International Development and the European Association of Development Institutes have no peace and conflict study groups. On the other hand, the International Peace Research Association has several study groups specifically or partially concerned with development, and the Peace Education Commission in particular defines peace education to include peace action and community development. There is not even a comparable development education forum at the international level, which has in part meant that some development educators have joined common cause with peace educators. The closest group with a specifically educational concern within development studies is the working group, "Teaching Development Studies", of the British and Irish Development Studies Association.

At the level of teachers there is even more diversification. In some instances there are development education groups outside the development assistance agency networks (variously called global studies, intercultural studies, education for international understanding and so on: none specifically use the term development education) working exclusively with teachers, and there is a World Studies Teacher Education Network and a Peace Education Network, with considerable overlap of personnel, in the United Kingdom. However, on the whole professional associations maintain the separation of the two issues and vie for teacher support and involvement.

4. Separation of Issues in the United Nations System. The promotion of peace and co-operation have a central place in the United Nations Charter. In 1974, the General Assembly of UNESCO adopted a recommendation concerning "Education for international understanding, co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms". However, in practice, development and peace are separated within the United Nations system.

Thus, education for international understanding is part of the School Section of UNESCO, whereas peace education comes under the Human Rights and Disarmament Section. The other agencies which have an educational role are the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and UNICEF. Within FAO, it is the task of the Action for Development Section of the Freedom from Hunger Campaign to carry out educational activity. It was in fact this section which initiated "qualitative" development education, holding a series of seminars in the early 1970s on development education for all the major sectors of society, from schools to trade unions and the mass media. It has also promoted an action-reflection programme at the grass-root level in both developed and especially developing countries, and facilitated contact between groups in both. UNICEF has also developed a development education programme, especially for children, as this publication testifies. It has largely focussed on developing country issues, though has broadened to include some consideration of local development, peace, disarmament and inter-cultural relations, especially in developed countries. At the United Nations public information level, development and environmental issues are the concern of the Division for Economic and Social Information (DESI) and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC, which includes questions of labour). ECOSOC has consultative relations with non-governmental organisations and development education is part of DESI's agenda. A Joint UN Information Committee was established in the early 1970s, within the Second Development Decade framework of mobilising public opinion, and it has provided a forum for promotion of development education. On the other hand, peace issues are mainly promoted through information about the Security Council and peace-keeping activities. This separation of development and peace issues by the United Nations and its agencies can be seen to play a role in keeping the issues separate more generally, both in the eyes of member governments, through information and education programmes, and through the relationships which each sphere of activity has with educational institutions, researchers and non-governmental groups. The effect is two-fold: keeping interest groups apart, and through the role which the United Nations plays in contributing to thinking on issues, legitimating this separation.(1)

---

(1) UNICEF has recognized the link between development education and peace education. In addition to its "Approach to Peace Education" Kit issued in 1980, UNICEF is now producing one on Lebanon which deals with the effect of war on the development of a Middle Eastern country. - Editor's Note

Towards Integration

It would appear that development and peace education run on different tracks. This does not necessarily place them in tension but does provide for potential competition for time, attention and resources. Before looking at the possibilities for integration, I would like to quote an example which shows that such integration is indeed more than a theoretical possibility.

In the autumn of 1981, a group of students in a Swedish comprehensive school became upset because one of their classmates, a Syrian girl from Lebanon, was with her family under deportation orders. The pupils formed a committee, maintained a twenty-four hour vigil in a public spot in Uppsala, undertook research into the situation in Lebanon and the situation of Syrians there, and began to find the right Swedish officials to lobby to try to reverse the deportation decision. At the time of writing, the case has not yet been resolved. However, the pupils themselves considered that their efforts had had some important results: they had begun to feel much more sympathetic towards other immigrants in the school and wanted to learn more of their plight, they had gained an understanding of the way the bureaucracy operates, and they had found out a lot about the political situation in contemporary Lebanon. Further, as self-initiated learning, they had also developed a method of working constructively and critically together. Obviously, the course of action would probably have been different if the teachers had initiated it, and it may never have arisen within the school context. However, the point is that when people take responsibility for their learning in relationship to a concrete situation, a new style with practical results is made possible.

Thus practice forms a basis for inter-relating issues such as development and peace. Distinctions are largely irrelevant in the struggle to define issues, act to bring about change, reflect on the present and plan for the future, with human liberation and social justice as the over-riding goals. Some contribution to these inter-relations is also being made by new theories, especially those based on a concept of structural violence which emphasise peace as a positive state in which development plays a significant role.

The challenge is to develop educational programmes and practices which reflect this inter-related reality. The starting point is not so important so long as it can lead on to other issues or a broader consideration of issues. It is the way in which the topics are selected and organised, so that connections can be made rather than issues closed off, tied up and put neatly on a shelf ("we did nutrition in biology last year", when it is suggested as the new topic within the field of world food production and distribution in geography), which is important. Also important is the extent to which the learners are enabled to play an active role in the learning process, so that it becomes a co-operative action, a dialogue between "teacher" and "taught", "school" and "community/world".

And this implies that the learning process is vital, for through the structures in which it takes place, learners discover how the world is ranked and ordered, their place in it and the possibility for change. The way in which learning is evaluated reinforces this, in two ways: through limiting learning to the reproduction of facts in competitive testing or enabling co-operative presentations to be evaluated by the group as a whole, and through the use of evaluation to assign social value to people through the jobs and rewards that they get on the basis of formal schooling. It is all too easy for evaluation to be the main message about social processes and individual worth which results from learning programmes, rather than evaluation reinforcing new approaches to learning and acting.

Conceptually, development and peace education share common goals, common hopes, common methods, if both are defined in a framework of participation in the search for justice and survival. There will be tension, not between the value of peace and the value of development, but between ideologies which separate the two issues and the means to achieve them. If dialogue is maintained, such tension can itself be fruitful, both for the refinement of ideas and for their testing in practice. Emphases may differ according to time, place and the specific needs of the people within an educational programme, but in matters so vital as human survival, the call must certainly be to work together in the task.